



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/085,010	03/01/2002	Pekka Kostainen	042933/301626	1138

826 7590 04/12/2006

ALSTON & BIRD LLP  
BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA  
101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000  
CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000

EXAMINER

PHU, SANH D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2618

DATE MAILED: 04/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/085,010

Applicant(s)

KOSTIAINEN ET AL.

Examiner

Sanh D. Phu

Art Unit

2618

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 03 April 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: 12-22.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see Attachment.  
12. ☒ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## ATTACHMENT

This Attachment is responsive to the Applicant's Response filed on 4/3/06.

1. The applicant mainly argues that (i) With respect to claims 12, 15 and 22, Andrews (5,911,121) does not teach or suggest a user exchangeable cover part having electrical circuitry for supporting the user interface of the wireless terminal, as claimed; and (ii), with respect to claims 13 and 20, Andrews does not teach or suggest a connector pin, as claimed.

-Regarding to part (i), the examiner respectfully disagrees. See figure 2, Andrews discloses a wireless terminal (10) having a user exchangeable cover part (44) which comprises a keypad (18) for the user interface of the wireless terminal (see col. 3, lines 5-10) where the key pad is itself a keypad circuitry (18) during the user interface, or in another word, the key pad has the keypad circuitry (18) for receiving electrical signal from Input/Output circuitry (16) (see figure 1, and col. 2, lines 58-67).

In the arguments, the applicant argues that in Andrews, the user exchangeable cover part does not have any electrical circuitry for supporting the user interface because Andrews printed circuit board (46) (which is not part of the user exchangeable cover part) contains all of the circuitry needed for each of the various phone models (by basing on Andrews disclosure, col3, lines 28-30 and col. 5, lines 13-15). The examiner disagrees with this argument. See col. 3, lines 13-16 and figure 1, Andrews discloses that the printed circuit board (46) contains the microprocessor (12), program memory (14), input/output circuits (16), audio processing circuits (22), receiver (24), transmitter (26) and signal combiner (32); namely, Andrews does not disclose that the printed circuit board (46) contains the keypad circuitry (18), as shown in figure 1. In Andrews, page 5, lines 13-18, it states "if different keypads 18 are used on different models, then the printed circuit board must be designed to include circuitry for each different keypad". As the examiner understood, it means that the printed circuit board must be designed in such way that the microprocessor (12), program memory (14), input/output circuits (16), audio processing circuits (22), receiver (24), transmitter (26) and signal combiner (32), which are contained in the printed circuit board, must be designed to include necessary circuitry for being interface with each different keypad circuitry. Besides, it is not found elsewhere in Andrews teaching that the printed circuit board (46) contains the keypad circuitry (18). Further, in Andrews, figure 10 shows a plan view of a printed circuit board (46) which comprises key contacts (48) for contacting with the respective keys of the keypad of the user exchangeable cover part (see col. 6, lines 50-53). The key contacts (48) inherently must be electrical contacts for electrically contacting with the respective keys of the keypad so that the keypad circuitry (18), as shown in figure 1, can receive the respective signal from the input/output circuits (16) during the respective keys of the keypad are used by the user (e.g., pressed by the user). Or in another word, on the user exchangeable cover part, the keypad circuitry (18) inherently must have or comprise an electrically conducting member at each key of the keypad for electrically contacting with a respective one of key contacts (48) in order to receive a signal from the input/output circuits (16), as shown in figure 1, during this each key is pressed by the user.


Based on the above rationale, it is deemed that Andrews teaches the user exchangeable cover part (44) having electrical circuitry (18) for supporting the user interface of the wireless terminal (10), as claimed.

-Regarding to part (ii), the examiner also disagrees. And the explanation is following.

With respect to claims 13 and 20, Andrews anticipates all the limitations recited in the claims. As shown in figures 2 and 3, Andrews teaches that the wireless terminal (10) and the user exchangeable cover part (44) is electrically interconnected by means of an electrical connector (60) wherein the connector has 4 connector pins "jumper pins (64)" as being a part of the user exchangeable cover part (see col. 3, line 23 to col. 4, line 22), (note that the 4 connector pins "jumper pins (64)" is considered here equivalent with the claimed limitation "connector pins"), and at least one of the connector pins is operated in a setting for an identification state of detection via an identification means (50) for sensing a resistor value (R1, R2 or R3) included in the identification means (50) (see figures 1 and 4) for identifying the user exchangeable cover part (see col. 3, line 53 to col. 22), and afterwards, (i.e., after the detection), is operated in operation state (by being remained in said setting), wherein the operation state operates the wireless terminal (10) which includes the associated keypad electrical circuitry (18) (see figure 1), (considered here equivalent with the claimed limitation "electrical circuitry"), of the user exchangeable cover part by a program configuration being selected by the microprocessor (12) based on the detection (see col. 4, lines 1-10).

2. Based on the Final Office Action issued on 2/9/06, a summary is follows:

- Claims 12-22 are provisionally double-patenting rejected as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of copending application 10/502,081.
- Claims 12, 13, 15-18, 20 and 22 are rejected, under 35 USC 102(b), as being anticipated by Andrews.
- Claim 19 is rejected, under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Andrews.

  
Matthew Anderson  
SPE 2618